

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

Robert B. Carey #011186
Donald Andrew St. John #024556
11 West Jefferson Street, Suite 1000
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Telephone: (602) 840-5900
Facsimile: (602) 840-3012
E-Mail: andy@hbsslaw.com

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

Steve W. Berman WSBA #12536
Thomas E. Loeser WSBA #38701
Genessa Stout WSBA #38410
1918 Eighth Avenue, Suite 3300
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: (206) 623-7292
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594
E-Mail: steve@hbsslaw.com
toml@hbsslaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

NATHANIEL JOHNSON and KRISTEN
PETRILLI, ABRAHAM NIETO; GLORIA
and CHARLES LEWIS; FABIAN and
MARIE PATRON, on behalf of themselves
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

KB HOME, a Delaware corporation;
COUNTRYWIDE FINANCIAL
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation;
COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS, INC., a
New York corporation; COUNTRYWIDE
MORTGAGE VENTURES, LLC, a
Delaware company; COUNTRYWIDE-KB
HOME LOANS, an unincorporated
association of unknown form, LANDSAFE,
INC., a Delaware corporation; LANDSAFE
APPRAISAL SERVICES, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 1000,

Defendants.

No. CV-09-972-PHX-FJM

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY TO KB
HOME'S OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
COMPEL DISCOVERY
RESPONSES FROM KB HOME**

1 In its opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel, KB Home confirms its failure to
2 produce documents in a timely manner and in accordance with the Rules. For the first
3 time, KB Home estimates that it is reviewing nearly one million pages of discovery, yet
4 only a small fraction of that has been produced. KB Home also confirms that no further
5 productions will occur until *after* Plaintiffs' deadline for expert disclosure passes on
6 March 5, 2010. Further, as of yesterday (March 1, 2010), KB Home started categorizing
7 its non-email responses and producing an additional ESI "load file" that will provide
8 information as to the source of the documents that have been produced. These ongoing
9 productions do not, however, lessen the prejudice caused by KB Home's late and
10 insufficient production or permit a timely evaluation by Plaintiffs.

11 KB Home claims that "the only issue presented by Plaintiffs' motion is whether or
12 not KB Home is required to provide a designation as to which requests each document is
13 responsive." This is only half right. Plaintiffs also have requested that KB Home
14 provide its responsive discovery in sufficient time for Plaintiffs' experts to incorporate
15 the evidence into their reports, with sufficient time to digest this enormous amount of
16 material to take depositions before the discovery cutoff and with a description of the
17 custodians searched so that Plaintiffs can assess whether an adequate search has been
18 performed. With experts' reports due in just days, Plaintiffs cannot avoid or recover from
19 this lack of information.

20 As to Plaintiffs' request for categorization, KB Home sets forth only a partial
21 picture. In *Conrail v. Grand Trunk W. R.R. Co.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. Lexis 118394, at *7-8
22 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 18, 2009), the court held:

23 The party arguing that it produced documents as they were kept in the
24 usual course of business bears the burden of showing that the
25 documents were so kept. *Nolan, L.L.C. v. TDC Intern. Corp.*, No. 06-
26 cv-14907, 2007 U.S. Dist. Lexis 84406, 2007 WL 3408584, at *2 (E.D.
27 Mich. November 15, 2007). A party does so by revealing such
28 information as where the documents were maintained, who maintained
them, and whether the documents came from one single source or file or
from multiple sources or files.

Even including the information KB Home provided the day it filed its Opposition to
Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel, KB Home has yet to indicate "whether the documents

1 came from one single source or file or from multiple sources or files.”

2 By way of example of the difficulties caused by KB Home’s non-designated
3 partial production, during review of the production to date, Plaintiffs discovered a
4 business plan document for the Countrywide/KB Home Loans joint venture, which is a
5 central aspect of the case. The clearly responsive document reports results and sets forth
6 plans for the joint venture. The document related to 2009, but Plaintiffs could find no
7 similar document for any other year in the class period. Plaintiffs informally inquired of
8 KB Home as to whether this document existed for other years and KB Home promptly
9 responded that it had located versions for the other years in the Class period, *and would*
10 *produce them in its next production on March 8.* Absent their special inquiry, Plaintiffs
11 would have had no way to know that these additional responsive documents existed and
12 were forthcoming. Furthermore, given the impending deadlines in the case, once these
13 documents were “located,” there was no reason for KB Home to withhold them until after
14 the expert cut-off. Finally, this example shows that KB Home’s sporadic production to
15 date prevents Plaintiffs from ascertaining a true picture of the evidence supporting their
16 allegations, or even ascertaining what has been produced and what may be forthcoming.

17 KB Home has frustrated Plaintiffs’ ability to comply with the Court’s Scheduling
18 Order through its delay in producing discovery and providing information reasonably
19 necessary for Plaintiffs to review and evaluate the information provided. Plaintiffs
20 request immediate production, and if that is impossible, Plaintiffs request the Court shift
21 the prejudice back onto KB Home through modification of the Scheduling Order with a
22 tight production deadline while providing Plaintiffs the period contemplated in the initial
23 Scheduling Order.

24 Plaintiffs respectfully suggest that both KB and Countrywide appear to be poised
25 to produce substantial quantities of documents. It takes time to file, analyze and study
26 these documents prior to commencing depositions and thus any revised order on
27 scheduling should account for that. The delay is not the fault of Plaintiffs who have been
28 pushing for timely responses since November 2009.

1 DATED: March 2, 2010

2 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

3 By s/ Robert B. Carey

4 Robert B. Carey

5 Donald Andrew St. John

6 11 West Jefferson Street, Suite 1000

7 Phoenix, Arizona 85003

8 By s/ Steve W. Berman

9 Steve W. Berman

10 Thomas E. Loeser

11 1918 Eighth Avenue, Suite 3300

12 Seattle, Washington 98101

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 2, 2010, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrant(s):

- **Bruce A. Abbott**
Bruce.Abbott@mto.com,
- **Steve W. Berman**
steve@hbsslaw.com
- **Brad D. Brian**
Brad.Brian@mto.com
- **Jonathan Grant Brinson**
jonathan.brinson@bryancave.com
- **Robert B. Carey**
rcarey@hbsslaw.com
- **Hailyn J. Chen**
hailyn.chen@mto.com
- **Truc T. Do**
truc.do@mto.com
- **Kelly Ann Kszywienski**
kkszywienski@swlaw.com
- **Thomas Loeser**
toml@hbsslaw.com
- **William Thomas Luzader , III**
wtl@kflawaz.com
- **Patricia Lee Refo**
prefo@swlaw.com
- **Peter C. Renn**
Peter.Renn@mto.com
- **Robert W. Shely**
rwshely@bryancave.com
- **James Demosthenes Smith**
jdsmith@bryancave.com
- **Donald Andrew St. John**
andy@hbsslaw.com
- **Genessa A. Stout**
genessa@hbsslaw.com

COPIES of the foregoing also served by
hand-delivery on March 2, 2010:

Patricia Lee Refo
Snell & Wilmer LLP
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202

Attorneys for Defendant KB HOME

Robert W. Shely
James D. Smith
Jonathan G. Brinson
Bryan Cave LLP
2 North Central Ave., Suite 2200
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4406

*Attorneys for Defendants Countrywide Financial Corporation; Countrywide Home
Loans, Inc.; Countrywide Mortgage Ventures, LLC; Countrywide- KB Home Loans;
LandSafe, Inc.; LandSafe Appraisal Services, Inc.*

By s/ Steve W. Berman
Steve W. Berman